



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,962	11/10/2000	Lars Severinsson	03370-P0022C	6142
24126 7590 11/09/2007 ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC 986 BEDFORD STREET STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619			EXAMINER: SCHWARTZ, CHRISTOPHER P	
			ART UNIT 3683	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/710,962
Filing Date: November 10, 2000
Appellant(s): SEVERINSSON, LARS

MAILED

NOV 09 2007

GROUP 3600

Wes Whitmyer
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed September 27, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed September 14, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 251

1. Claims 29-32 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

Regarding claim 29 note applicants omit claiming the cover as a part of a self sustained unit in a brake, mechanism.

In the parent case 08/817769 the limitation of the cover was claimed in combination with the housing see patent claim 1 line 3 (note the examiner made an amendment to this claim to overcome 112 second paragraph combination-subcombination problems at that time). Note also in the patent claim beginning with line 5 applicant claims structure, namely "two thrust sleeves (8)... arranged on the cover for disposal in the housing..."

In the specification of the parent patent 5,833,035 column 2 note line 29"but

the cover and the rest of the mechanism are also held together as a unit..."

At page 6 over to page 7 of applicants remarks in the original application 08/817,769 applicants stated "Parent claim 1 is amended to better structurally define applicants novel feature wherein the housing and cover members are structured with the entire braking unit carried by the cover independently from the housing to be inserted as a unit".

Note also applicants remarks in paper no. 5 filed in the first reissue application 09/324,506. At page 4 line 13 applicants state "the "mechanism as a unit" is clearly disclosed, wherein the cover and the rest of the mechanism is held together in the absence of the housing 1 ". At page 5 line 10 in the same amendment applicants state "However, applicant provides a unitary assembly that is assembled outside the housing and thus is inserted as a unit into the housing". Presumably this "unit" must include the cover. These latter remarks were directed at distinguishing applicants invention from the Antony et al. reference.

From these arguments it is remains unclear then how the cover can be left out of the picture if the inner workings of the brake mechanism are attached to it for insertion into the housing "as a unit". It therefore remains the examiner's position that the invention, as originally claimed, is the combination of the housing and the cover and the inner workings of the brake mechanism. One of the errors in the declaration submitted in the parent reissue states "... that no independent claim is broadly directed to the concept that the two thrust sleeves, cross bar and lever are preassembled as a unit prior to installation in the caliper"... Upon further consideration this supposed error is somewhat

confusing because the first set of independent claims (13 and 21) filed with the parent reissue case both had the cover limitation in them. The "error" in the declaration hinted nothing about the omission of the cover as the basis for the reissue. Note also that nowhere in the specification does it state these specific elements (bearing tappets and thrust sleeves) are preassembled without the cover.

(10) Response to Argument

As discussed on page 5 in the response filed 6/18/02 applicant's argue "the cover does not relate to surrendered subject matter, as the cover itself was not added and no arguments about the presence of the cover itself were made in an effort to overcome a prior art rejection." Further it is argued that there was no argument made that the cover itself was required for novelty and that the examiner has already indicated that the cover is not required for novelty by specifically indicating the claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

The examiner maintains that applicants presented arguments in the original ('769) application the cover was a necessary limitation for novelty. At page 6 over to page 7 of applicants remarks in the original application 08/817769 applicants stated "Parent claim 1 is amended to better structurally define applicants novel feature wherein the housing and cover members are structured with the *entire braking unit carried by the cover* independently from the housing to be inserted as a unit".

Note also applicants remarks in paper no. 5 filed in the first reissue application 09/324506. At page 4 line 13 applicants state "the "mechanism as a unit" is clearly disclosed, wherein the cover and the rest of the mechanism is held together in the absence of the housing 1".

The surrender of claimed subject matter can occur by argument alone. See *Hester Industries, Inc. V. Stein, Inc.* 142 F.3d 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Further, the issue of patentability (novelty) and the issue of recapture are independent. Just because the claims have been indicated to be patentable over the prior art of record does not mean the recapture rule no longer applies.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Christopher P. Schwartz

Conferees:

Christopher P. Schwartz *CPS*

Robert Siconolfi *RS*

Meredith Petravick *mp*



CHRISTOPHER P. SCHWARTZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER